DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 125 EA 003 251

AUTHOR Howard, A. Eugene
TITLE Determining Educational Policy: Who Shall Be Involved?
PUB DATE Jul 70
NOTE 16p.; Speech presented at Southern Association of Colleges and Schools southwide conference on elementary education (5th, Daytona Beach, Florida, July, 1970)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Activism, Administrator Role, *Educational Planning, *Educational Policy, Parent Associations, *Parent Participation, Student Organizations, *Student Participation, Teacher Administrator Relationship, Teacher Associations, *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

This document discusses (1) the method of determining who shall be involved in educational policymaking, (2) the forces that currently control educational policymaking, (3) the forces that are intruding on educational government, and (4) the ways these intruding forces can be utilized to strengthen democracy and to help resolve some of the problems challenging society. This report argues that these intruding forces -- parents, teachers, unions, and students -- should be included in policymaking discussions so that dissent can be incorporated effectively and constructively into the fabric of educational policymaking. (JF)

ED046125

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DETERMINING EDUCATIONAL POLICY: WHO SHALL BE INVOLVED?

BY

A. EUGENE HOWARD

Professor of Education
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, Texas

SPEECH DELIVERED

AT

FIFTH SOUTHWIDE CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA

JULY, 1970

EA 003 251

DETERMINING EDUCATIONAL POLICY: WHO SHALL BE INVOLVED?

A. Eugene Howard

The facets and ramifications of the questions to which I address my remarks are virtually boundless. Therefore, I have chosen to center this presentation around four facets of the problem which I shall consider as a whole. Those facets, formulated as questions are:

1) How do we determine who shall be involved?

2) What forces currently control educational policy making?

3) What forces are intruding upon educational government?

4) How can we include the intruding forces so as to strengthen democracy and help resolve some of the problems challenging our society?

The matter of determining who shall be involved in making educational policy couches itself philosophically and practically in the nature of the society we have - or, more importantly, in the kind of society we desire. A decade or so ago it was relatively accurate to proclaim that the American people desired a society whose hallmark was freedom; a society which encouraged the active involvement of all its citizens in the making of the laws and policies by which they would be governed; a society based on law and justice - the same law and justice for all under the protection and liberation of the Bill of Rights.

Certainly, the flowery tapestry of educational literature has abounded with our verbal commitments to democratic goals and principles, the dignity and worth of the individual, and the hopeful fulfillment of the American dream. But can we now be assured that our society still wishes the school to perpetuate these goals. If so, then the question of who shall be involved in determining educational policy is rather clear for in a democracy, the widest representative involvement of all those affected by educational policy should be accomplished. This position was endorsed thirty years ago by the N.E.A. - A.A.S.A. sponsored Educational Policies Commission when they wrote, "The formulation of school policy should be a cooperative process capitalizing the intellectual resources of the whole staff...This procedure...makes the school in reality a unit of democratic society." That policy statement fell short of the goal, however, in that it failed to include capitalizing on the resources of the students and parents in this democratic process. In itself, a widening of the base of involvement poses sufficiently difficult problems of implementation... the more varied the backgrounds and aspirations of those involved, the more likely it is that dissent and disagreement will arise, confrontations be aroused and ways of mediating differences have to be evolved and employed.

This whole matter of who shall be involved becomes clouded if the maintenance of freedom and democracy under the Bill of Rights is no longer a goal of this society. In the past few years and most especially in the past few months, we have seen growing upon the American people a gnawing distress about their way of life and with it a distrust of democracy and freedom which they fear are producing the unrest and violence in our society. Walter Knebel, writing in a recent issue of Look magazine, suggests that this distress and distrust flows from a score of sources:

> the war in Vietnam and Cambodia, inflation, crime, the rebellion of the young, the welfare "mess," the mechanization and depersonalization of society, riots, the assaults on almost every institution from the Roman Catholic Church to the American Medical Association, the proliferation of drugs, the lightening changes of attitude toward sex, family, church and authority, the squalor and informity of the big cities, the clamor of minorities for room at the top and/or revolution, a growing realization that the brave new American Empire must retrench and curb its missionary passion to remake the world in its own image, the immense lethal force and influence of the U.S. military machine, the fouling of the atmosphere, waters and soils, the lack of knightly leaders who can summon their countrymen on quests for the Holy Grail, a new despair that there are no Holy Grails and above all, a gnawing suspicion that modern society is a hostile, capricious force that can be endured by seeking refuge in the smuggeries of family and self (5).

Unquestionably, this country is on edge. Seen from one perspective, as Harold Taylor suggests, we can consider the present unrest in America and across the world as a consequence of the breaking up of an old order and the transitional stage into a new order in which the poor, the ignorant, the uneducated, as well as the young, shall have their rights recognized and the things which they wish to have from life also placed on the agenda of their governments and their communities (9).

A new order and new societal goals and values emerge slowly in a democratic society. For in a diversified culture such as ours which has fostered a belief in individuality, we must anticipate and welcome the inevitable conflicts of interest which arise. Most of all we must provide new and effective means for this conflict and dissent to boil and bubble until rational inquiry and peaceful persuasion emerge. Only then can responsible recommendations and constructive actions effect the changes desired with assurance of equity and justice for all.

Yet, in the last few months, we have seen the American people animated as Henry Steel Commager says, "by impatience, anger and fear, giving up their essential liberties not for safety but for the appearance of safety." Commager, in his brilliant Look magazine article, "Is Freedom Dying in America?", quotes Edmund Burke who, two centuries ago said that Americans "snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze." Yet, Commager, that distinguished historian and scholar, fears that now our senses are blunted. He states,

> The evidence of the public opinion polls is persuasive that a substantial part of the American people no longer know or cherish the Bill of Rights. They are, it appears, quite prepared to silence criticism of governmental policies if such criticism is thought - by the government - damaging to the national interest. They are prepared to censor newspaper and television reporting if such reports are considered - by the government - damaging to the national interest. As those in authority inevitably think whatever policies they persue, whatever laws they enforce, whatever wars they fight are in the national interest, this attitude is a formula for the ending of all criticism, which is another way of saying for the ending of democracy .... Timid men who have no confidence in the processes of democracy or in the potentialities of education are ready to abandon for a police state the experiment that Lincoln called 'the last best hope of earth' (3).

Those in high office do not openly proclaim their disillusionment with the principles of freedom, but they confess it by their conduct, "while we, the people, acquiesce in our own disinheritance by passively abandoning the 'eternal vigilance' that is the price of liberty." It appears that instead of willingly treading the veil of tears that leads to the solution of our problems and the expansion of our democracy we are more willing to enter what Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City and Senator Margaret Chase Smith have termed a new period of repression.

Let us be mindful that these Americans who seem so willing to relinquish their rights of democratic citizenship for the false security of a police state were only a few short years ago our students. Perhaps, however, we in education should be the least surprised at the state of the nation in which individuals fail to make responsible choices, fail to defend individual liberties and the right to differ, tend to turn to authority figures to tell them what is good and right and exempt from challenge. For despite all our protestations to the contrary, the schools have contributed mightily to this way of thinking and acting. The schools have been and still are of all institutions the most conservative, the least open to criticism, the most repressive and authoritarian and the least

changed over the years. We have helped convince many of yesterday's children that government in the form of the school - the consummate welfare state - can and will most wisely decide for the student citizen the important questions of mind as well as of body - but that the system will decide for the student and advise him what is in his best interests.

It is the educational power structure that has kept teachers in a no-politics, no-power stance that has made them until very recent years, impotent to participate in the process of making policies which affect their personal and professional life. We have employed the line-staff organization to enforce the concept that Pedagogical Big Brother in the front office knows what is best and that loyal followership is the laudible role of the good teacher.

It is the educator who, in his admirable struggle to achieve the status of "profession" for his vocation, has systematically intimidated and alienated parents - disenfranchising them from their rightful partnership in the education of their own children. We have not done this with intentional malice. It has been done subtly, defensively, as we have sought to perpetrate on the lay public the same fraud perpetrated on us - namely the belief that critical decisions in education should be made solely by the elite and experts who are qualified; the conviction that consumers of education properly should accept without undue resistance the policies which are considered - by the educational government - to be in the interest of education.

In the light of the authoritarian, repressive and punitive nature of educational government and administration, it is a wonder that even a small remnant of our former students have left within them the will to dissent. But the urge of the human spirit for freedom will not be quelled and today the passive conforming mass is faced with a growing number of young people, teachers and parents who are railing against the hypocrisy of the system that proclaims its goals to be the perpetuation of freedom, justice and law in a democracy and yet continues to practice the rankest forms of discrimination, repression and bureaucratic intimidation. This growing number of Americans, who love their country too much to let it remain in its self-destructive condition, or regress to earlier stages, will not be satisfied with idealistic intentions about democratizing the government of education. Either the structure of this government will be purposely opened to provide ways to constructively include opposition and dissent or those forces shall forcefully intrude upon that structure, possibly without a chance for their most effective incorporation.

In order to determine what means may provide the most effective inclusion of those who shall be involved in determing educational policy, we must understand the governing system of education so that the points of access may be found and, thus, changes made.

A serious indictment of education is that significant public decisions are made by a small elite. Since World War II academic research has attempted to determine whether there is, in fact, an elitist power structure and, if so, to identify its participants. It is usually assumed that the elite is composed of men of wealth and social power who rule in their own self-interest, and who make decisions which serve the interests of the class from which they are drawn. A number of studies report that, in reality, the crucial decisions about education ARE made by a small in-group of leading community figures in cooperation with professional educators, usually in their hire. This has resulted in an educational system which reflects the interests of this elite and maintains that system to serve primarily the American white middle class. But let us note that this elite usually consists of men out of the public view, not holding office, and that most mayors, superintendents and school board members do not belong to the elite but rather are errand boys for it (2).

There are those, according to Alan K. Campbell in his insightful Saturday Review article entitled "Who Governs Our Schools?" (2), who accept the power structure domination theory without adequate consideration. For example, those who accept this rather simplistic explanation, tend to assume that the formal system of government is relatively unimportant. They believe that when the formal structure changes, the elite simply adjusts its control techniques to fit the new system. In part and most especially in small homogeneous communities, this may be true. Yet we know that it makes a difference that the federal government has supplemented educational resources. Being one of the newest actors on the stage of school government, the federal government is exerting the greatest amount of political freedom in educational matters. It has directed attention to the most neglected portion of our population, the disadvantaged. In so doing, it has incurred the political wrath of local power structures which resent this intrusion on turf which they have previously controlled without serious interference.

The intrusion of the federal government into local and state education has created a force which extends policy making beyond the interests of most self-serving elites. In some cases, such as in Head Start, the federal programs have required the inclusion of parents and others served by the program in the decision making process. In many of these federal programs, however, the potential for parent involvement has gone unrealized. Saddled with the assumption of the line-staff heirarchy, many programs like Title I ESEA were planned in the front office without the meaningful involvement of parents and often without the participation of teachers and principals who toiled in disadvantaged neighborhood schools. Once again educational government demonstrated its failure to exercise its verbal commitments to democracy and ignored the basic principle that involvement in policy making is the right and privilege of all those affected by these policies.

The result was a massive expenditure of funds which often ill-served the real needs of the poor, were less than

enthusiastically received by disadvantaged children or their parents (and sometimes their teachers) and which in more ways than not have contributed little of significance in resolving the problems for which our nation earmarked millions of tax dollars. This failure to incorporate the recipients of educational services in the selection and planning of those services, has led to a not-to-be denied demand, most conspicuously noted in the black disadvantaged community, for the decentralization of the school system, the improvement of schools and most especially for participation in the decision-making process. These demands will not be stilled by superficial involvement through PTA's or discussion groups or a once-a-year trip to the ballot box. These parents want not only to be where the action is, they want to be instigators of some of that action.

The wave of parental involvement has only begun. It is the wave of the future. The big difficulty with demands for change by the electorate, as Campbell (2) points out, is the inevitable lack of precision on their part as to what kind of change is needed. Parental involvement may lead to the improvement of education but, unless educators find ways of contributing their expertise so that parents trust and accept it, this may not be the case. Nevertheless, it does not seem unreasonable that those who consume government services should have something to say about their quality and operation.

The present formal governing system of education does not provide much opportunity for the continuous presentation of alternatives. This lack results, in part, from the absence of a built-in opposition to the formal system which in civil government is represented by political parties. Thus, it behooves us to consider the creation of a means by which opposition may be built into the system.

One means by which this might be realized would be through the creation of Parent Advisory Committees as adjuncts to Boards of Education in each community. Paid and elected by the people, the Parent Advisory Committee members would be drawn from each neighborhood school area and elected only by the people residing in that area. This group would serve as the forum for dissent. To this representative body, organized pressure groups and interested individuals would bring their points of view and insistent demands. Conflicting interests within and among subdistricts of the community could clash openly. Here dissent, through the tools of mediation, compromise, and professional guidance, could be hammered into proposals and mandates to the board of education. In such a democratic forum, there is a real chance that citizens may begin to rediscover their power as Americans. It could rekindle the feeling of belonging to a system in which one's peers and in which one may hold unpopular opinions without fear of recrimination.

This kind of organization for which I present only a beginning blueprint, challenges the rather limited control of education now enjoyed by the elite and the educational bureaucracy and it provides a powerful means of democratizing the school. One way

or the other parents shall be involved. Either the governmental structure must open itself to dialog with all responsible agents seeking change and reconstruction or it must face the real probability that it shall have the doors to the policy-making chamber torn off their hinges, figuratively ... and perhaps literally.

In the governmental structure of education, the role of teachers and lower echelon administrators has been that of "low man on the totem pole." While the teacher and principal popularly are held responsible for the quality of the education provided children, they, in reality, have little to do with determining the quality of the system. It is not altogether defensive rationalization on their part when these people protest that they are restricted from effecting real changes in the schools. In many ways these people are the captives of the community in which they operate. Their day-to-day responsibilities are so great that they are engaged full time in keeping the system in operation. They make every effort to avoid controversy and, in general, to keep the boat from rocking. It is unrealistic to look to these people to initiate educational changes on their own. It is ridiculous to be critical of their behavior for their positions make it inevitable.

The impotent position of teachers in policy-making results in large part from the fact that they lack a strong political base. Teachers have witnessed too often what happens in communities undergoing rapid change or conflict. Public conflict and concern in school districts leads to greater voter turnout and there is a high correlation between greater voter turnout and the defeat of referendums and incumbant school board members. Citizens, often uninformed about the nature of the local conflict, hope to resolve the conflict by removing those in office no matter how capably they may have served. In such high-conflict situations, due to their no-politics stance, school people tend to lose support within the community. Under stress, the board tends to withdraw from its reliance on and permissive attitude toward the educational expert. Thus, when change and innovation are most needed, school officials are least allowed to provide it (2).

Until recent years, education has feigned a no-politics character. Yet education is very much a part of politics - as is any public function. The heated local school district squabbles and elections as well as state and federal political involvement make it apparent that a no-politics position does not eliminate politics from education. Teachers can only become participants in determining educational policy when they establish their own political power-base.

David Minar is quoted as stating in his paper to the Cubberly Conference at Stanford University in 1966 that

> conflict over public school questions lacks a sustaining structure. This means that instead

> of there being opposition to the established order at all times...there is opposition only when there is something special to oppose. The consequence of this situation is...that the authority system is not usually accustomed to being opposed and therefore it lacks resilience. Conflict is likely to come to it as a disorganizing shock. Whereas in most democratic government, structured conflict is recognized as the way the game is played, in school government it often seems to be regarded as a rude and foreign intrusion (2).

Minar's observations may serve as some further justification for my earlier recommendation calling for the creation of Parent Advisory Committees which I believe should be adjuncts to every school district in the Southern Association and requisite for accreditation. Further, there is the implication that a politically powerful teachers' organization also may provide a source of sustained opposition to the system. By this means, teachers can be involved in the decision making process. It is no wonder that many state teachers' organizations are dominated by administrators. It is an effective way to keep teachers from intruding on the current structure of government.

It would be far wiser for professional educators to be engaged in a harmonious effort to build a unitary political force. One would assume that teachers and administrators have a strong common interest in improving the human condition through education and that this common interest transcends their differences. Yet the growing alienation of the classroom teacher from the institution in which he works is the unfortunate and unnecessary by-product of past and present practices in educational policy formation. We hear teachers speaking now in terms of collective bargaining and negotiations so that the difference between teacher and factory worker becomes increasingly difficult to discern. The basic reason for this alienation may be stated as a lack of meaningful involvement. As Sherman Frey points out "Meaningful involvement is best defined in terms of feelings - teacher feelings - feeling that his point of view is heard, respected, can result in change" and that he is not being manipulated by others to do their bidding. "Yet, teachers, seeking recognition of their professional competencies, remain outside the mainstream of educational planning and policy making" (4).

The inappropriateness of the line-staff concept of personnel relationships contributes powerfully to the alienation of the teacher from meaningful involvement. "The heirarchy of position created by this form of organization logically assumes that leadership in educational matters properly lies in the upper echelon; followership must be exercised by those below. This creates the denial and alienation of highly educated people" (4). It is the commitment of the administrator to the line-staff organization that serves to make it impossible for teachers to be associated with administrators in the creation of a

political power base. All the while, we educators claim to be expert in our understanding of human behavior, problem solving, decision making, group process and interpersonal relations.

As in the case of the alienated parent, forces are rising to bring the teacher forward on the stage of policy determination. Unfortunately, this will probably have to be accomplished through another decade or two of militancy, strikes, and demonstrations. But in time teachers will create increasingly powerful political pressure groups that can demand and receive a satisfactory resolution to their quests. Much conflict and long-term separation of teachers and others interested in education could be avoided by the creation of Teacher Advisory Boards. These groups would serve to "rap" and scrap with Parent Advisory Committees with the superintendent and administrative staff as well as dealing directly with the board of education on matters of budgeting and finance, salaries, tenure, working conditions in addition to curriculum, methodology, new programs, and other matters concerning the relevant education of children and youth. As teachers participated, the feeling of alienation would have an opportunity to subside and as teachers became more knowledgeable about the operations of the school, they would tend to be more positive agents for its improvement.

In Japan, the national teachers union is not only the largest union in the entire country, but one of the most militant, most politically minded opponents of the economic, social and educational establishment. We may anticipate that American teachers will demand an increasingly significant role in civil and educational government. This they will accomplish even if it requires them to leave professional organizations which are reluctant to use political power and to accept a trade union status where muscle will be employed to bring the establishment into negotiation or submission. The creation of Teacher Advisory Boards would provide another example of the democratization of educational government. Such Boards could set the pattern for resolving other social problems as teachers learn and teach the skills of constructive confrontation and creative, non-violent dissent. But we cannot lead where we will not go!

Lastly, let us come to the role of the student in determining educational policy. Here, truly, is the individual most sorely outraged by his restriction from meaningful involvement. Even in the matter of teacher-pupil planning, which leading educators have advocated for decades, we have failed to engage the student. It takes few trips into the classrooms of this nation to realize that the ideal of teacher-pupil participation in the planning of learning is hardly discernable in most classroom practice. Some may point to the creation of student councils of one kind or another as evidence of student participation. In fact, however, these councils are so circumscribed in the functions which they are permitted to perform that they provide little opportunity other than for students to conform to and support the powers-that-be.

Insightful students quickly recognize and reject this game

of "Uncle Tomism." It is little wonder that many of them start their own game entitled "Hump the Establishment." Our failure to effectively involve students in the role of policy making is no small factor contributing to the irrelevancy of contemporary education.

Students from nursery school to graduate school are frustrated by the lack of relevancy in their education. From the toddler's talking typewriter to the doctoral candidate's dissertation, there is a growing sense of the separation of schooling and education. As Herbert Schneider points out,

> Schooling is an artificiality. As a harness is to a horse, so schooling becomes to the child. The child begins his school life of conscious labor and relaxed leisure at the normal factory rate of five to two ... five days of school to two free days.. five hours of school to two of recreation. School becomes obligatory and irreproachable child labor. Schooling is essentially harnessing, burden bearing, submission to the day's work, initiation into the attitude of a willing, competitive worker..(7).

There is something pathetic about this. Children become laboring animals before they can critically ask: Is this labor also productive? Does it contribute to the hopes and aspirations which I hold? Not being certain of the answer, the student asks us and receives the reply that he will need this labor to do the labor in the next grade or the next. The child is given little or no part in determining the purpose or direction for his educational endeavors. Most of the children submit to the rape of schooling. But the hostilities aroused by irrelevant curriculum and inane teaching and the repressed involvement in directing their own life grow year after year. In time we see this hostility bursting upon the educational scene with alarming violence.

It is convenient not to see the seeds of violence in the earlier school years. Nevertheless, they are liberally sprinkled before us every day in the form of the student who just won't apply himself, who won't work up to his potential; the superficially conforming "nice" student who cleverly instigates unrest and disruption; the child mistakenly labeled "lazy" who uses his passive aggression to fight the system until he is big enough and old enough to rebel actively; the truant; the school hero whose name appears most frequently on the paddle of ardent disciplinarians.. and these are but a few examples. These children, and there are hundreds of thousands of them, are trying in the only ways they can to point up the fact that education in America as well as other parts of the world is increasingly artificial, if not obsolete! Artificial and obsolete, Theodore Brameld says, "in the sense that education distorts, conceals and avoids many of the fundamental perplexities and compulsions of our age" (1).

Agnes Snyder highlights a similar point in her recounting

of the comments of a teacher from Israel who had visited some of our more modern schools. Asked her opinion, the Israeli teacher replied, "Your children work on problems as ours do. But yours seem to be playing at living. Our children bring the problems of the community into the classroom. They know that they are really responsible for solving them." American students, on the other hand, are aware at an early age that the school world and the real world have little in common. They become increasingly sensitive to the fact that they are manipulated and coerced through a game of pedagogical maze-running in which they have no power to change the rules of the game much less any chance to change the game itself. We cannot long expect that children reared in a technical-industrial society, exposed to the realities of human conditions and changing mores can be salted away in an educational deep freeze which is virtually irrelevant to the real world; that they can be told that they may not be socially involved or politically active when we have made them a major economic force in the culture.

Theodore Brameld (1) has suggested that we must repudiate, from the nursery school on, the view that education must be designed primarily to assure the young, and even more their parents, that they should go to college and that in order to do so they must spend 12 to 14 years working to meet the admission standards established by the college. Not only are concerned educators beginning to question why the typical public school curriculum should be tailor-made for the conventional college-bound student, but we are more seriously questioning whether the curriculum is a defensible one even for him. To a shocking extent the high school and college curricula of today are the same as they were 40 years or more ago...an egg crate of courses with little, if any, significant relation either to each other or to the central streams of life around them. All, or mostly all, are still bound by the all-too-familiar rubrics of English, mathematics, science, social sciences and foreign language plus a smattering of peripheral subjects. And, alas, as the academicians increasingly have been invited to structure the public school curriculum, the elementary school has taken on the irrelevancy of the high school and college (1).

It is not surprising that today's college student and his counterparts in elementary and high school are increasingly intolerant of the irrelevancy and coercion which characterizes contemporary schooling. Educators and the lay public alike must recall that this generation which so actively rejects much of the tradition and many of the established values of the American school and society is the first generation of children to be educated under the "Sputnikation" of education. It is today's college students who were just beginning their schooling when the heavy hand of societal censure squeezed us all for allowing the Russians to excel the Americans. It is these youngsters who are the first products of an era of pressure, coercion, and intimidation which flowed from every forum from the halls of Congress to the local barber shop. It was these children who were charged with the responsibility of beating our

idealogical enemies to the conquering of space and environment whether they chose to or not. Forces set in motion in 1957 are just beginning to pay their dividends.

In order to achieve those goals relativist educators yielded to every new onslaught on the humanity of the school. With no will to withstand these assaults, they virtually invited every effort to achieve so-called excellence at any human price. They climbed aboard every passing bandwagon from mad mod math, through sudden science, panicky P.E., mother media, languishing linguistics and groping grouping. They specialized education in disasterous ways. As a result they had to devise remedies for the casualties they caused. Remediation, rehabilitation, redoing--these remedies were made available for a few of our planned failures by a benevolent society which is not so unkind as it is irrational in not providing opportunities for mediation, for habilitation, for doing the appropriate thing when the time is ripe.

As Harold Taylor has said,

> The school was intendend to be a community center where all kinds and conditions of humans could come together to learn from each other - Italian, Irish, German, Negro, Catholic, Jew, atheist, Chinese, artist, the poor, rich, Midwesterner, Southerner and even plain white native Americans. The distance we have skidded down the slippery slope from that ideal can be seen in the fact that we now talk so much about education for the disadvantaged, remedial reading, corrective mathematics, integration techniques, compensatory education, speech clinics, tutorial centers, after-school study centers, evening projects. There is so much talk of so much talk of so many special remedies that I often wonder why in God's name we don't set to in full force and do what has to be done during and in school so that we wouldn't spend such incredible amounts of money, time and energy trying to redo, undo and add to what is obviously such an unproductive way to spend the child's time in the first place (9).

It is, considering the monumental forces which have worked against them, amazing to see that it is the young who now demand changes which more progressive educators have long sought. With the rising power that comes from their prowess in the American economic structure, the young are demanding a part in the government of education. They, too, are clamoring for a part in the decision making process.

Writing in the January 10, 1970, issue of SR, Robert S. Powell, Jr. (6), a student, says, "Student power...implies a more democratic standard of governance, a standard that encourages people to make their own decisions and choices, a standard that aims at developing young people who are capable of thinking for themselves, of using freedom and power wisely."

"The goal of education," Powell continues, "should be to free people by teaching them how to do their own thinking." Under the current system of educational government Powell sees little democracy in action. However, he points out that a democratic process is not needed if the object of the school is to decide whether the student has passed enough tests or credit hours to get promoted or receive his degree. Grades, Powell claims,

> are the central instrument of coercion employed by the school against the student. Grades destroy the very educational goal they purport to have, namely useful evaluation of learning. Testing only the student's ability to memorize facts and notes and acceptable interpretations, the teacher discovers only the most superficial aspects of what the student has learned. By giving the student a letter grade or a percentage score, he informs the student quite inadequately about his strengths and weaknesses and future directions needed for growth.

Powell then insists that the educators' monopoly must be broken by making students equal partners in building the curriculum and in making all the related decisions about grading, requirements, new courses, the school calendar, etc. Breaking the monopoly also means including the students in decisions about faculty competence, hiring and promotions (6).

To many educators steeped in the tradition of authoritarian control of the schools, such demands are considered seditious. Yet they are indeed demands that cannot be cast aside in the same vein in which protest petitions in my high school days were given cursory consideration. We have seen that too much chaos ensues when we provide students no avenue of communication, no tangible evidence that his wants, demands and protests will be given genuine consideration by groups in which he has membership. From the earliest educational experiences of children, we must make participation in determining policy, practice, and curriculum a high level priority of teaching. Classroom, school-wide and district, state, and nation-wide participation will be essential if the student is to value his democratic heritage and gain his rightful representation in the government of education.

It does not serve to resolve problems of student involvement when men in high places seek to repress student dissent. It does not serve the cause of democracy when we are led to "equate dissent with lawlessness and nonconformity with treason." The widespread harrassment of the young may be superficially directed at their hairstyles, dress or manners, but in reality it is directed at their opinions and perhaps to their youthfulness itself. Such harrassment and intimidation reminds those of us old enough to remember of the early days of the third reich. It is frightening to hear men close to the White House proclaiming that protest leaders should be separated from our society - "with no more regret than we should feel over discarding rotten apples from a barrel" (3).

The right of dissent is the foundation stone of democracy. A nation that allows dissent to be silenced, whether by force, intimidation or the withholding of information invites disaster. Students shall be involved. It is up to us to change the structure of educational government so that their involvement may become active, genuine and constructive.

The creation of groups such as Parent Advisory Committees, Teacher Advisory Boards and Student Involvement Groups will bring about no small change in the educational superstructure. Such alterations invite complication of the policy-making procedure. They require the formulation of new patterns of participation and mediation. They mean the evolving of effective techniques to sustain dissent and to convert it into rational inquiry, open discussion and peaceful persuasion. Most of all, it requires a people who believe in democracy and are willing to engage in the democratic processes without fear of the outcome when no predetermined ends have been foreshadowed by an elitest power structure. These proposed alternations in no way seek to exclude the administrator nor the elected board member from their role in policy making. Conversely, it enlarges and democratizes their role by making these groups more immediately privy to the needs and desires of the people and by providing them progressively well-honed resolutions and mandates by which they can carry out the will of the people.

This task cannot be accomplished by frightened little men uncertain of the wisdom of extending the powers of government to more of the people. It cannot be accomplished by men who prefer to limit democracy in the government of education and to continue the dangerous luxury of domination by a small elite. The task will never be realized if educators continue to seek professional control of the schools without the meaningful involvement of parents and students - for what is professional control to education may become tyrannical domination to others. We cannot assume that what is good for educators is necessarily good for children.

I am aware that the recommendations I have made require much of the schools. I believe, however, that the public school is the institution in which new forms of democratic participation can be devised through experimentation, study and the willful alteration of its governmental structure so as to incorporate dissent and opposition effectively and constructively into the fabric of educational policy making. By evolving this new structure, we can set the pattern for the larger society to become more democratic, more dynamic and more open to change. For if America and education are not able to manage change, we are likely to see America and education change managers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brameld, Theodore. "Illusions and Disillusions in American Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 4, (December, 1968), pp. 202-207.

2. Campbell, Alan K. "Who Governs Our Schools?" Saturday Review, Volume 51, (December 21, 1968), pages 50-53.

3. Commager, H.S. "Is Freedom Dying in America?" Look, Volume 34, No. 14, (July 14, 1970), pages 16-21.

4. Frey, Sherman. "Policy Formulation - A Plan Involving Teachers," Clearing House, Volume 43, No. 5, (January, 1969), pages 259-263.

5. Knebel, Walter. "What's Worrying America?" Look, Volume 33, No. 23, (November 18, 1969), pages 23-32.

6. Powell, Robert S., Jr. "Participation Is Learning," Saturday Review, Volume 53, No. 2, (January 10, 1970), pages 56, 58, 82.

7. Schneider, Herbert W. "Schooling, Learning, and Education," Education Forum, Volume 29, No. 1, (November, 1964).

8. Snyder, Agnes, "Students Demand Change," Childhood Education, Volume 45, No. 1, (September 30, 1968), pages 11-14.

9. Taylor, Harold. "The Human Element in Human Affairs," Childhood Education, Volume 44, No. 3, (November, 1967), pages 177-182.